



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

A

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/927,015	08/09/2001	Andrew R. Golding	10984-601001	4152

26161 7590 12/09/2005

FISH & RICHARDSON PC

P.O. BOX 1022

MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55440-1022

EXAMINER

LY, ANH

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2162

DATE MAILED: 12/09/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/927,015

Applicant(s)

GOLDING, ANDREW R.

Examiner

Anh Ly

Art Unit

2162

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 September 2005.
2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-28 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) 9-15, 18 and 25 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8, 16, 17, 19-23 and 26-28 is/are rejected.
7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 01 August 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This Office Action is response to Applicant's Amendment filed on 09/23/2005.
2. Claim 18 has been cancelled.
3. Claims 1-8, 16-17, 19-23 and 26-28 are pending in this application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

4. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

5. Claims 1, 8, 16 and 26-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Because "a selected element of the database and a selected field in the selected element" does not support in the application specification. What a selected element of the database is and what a selected field in the selected element is. It is unclear how one having ordinary skill in the art will understand the recited limitation. Applicant is advised to amend the claims to provide a clear and concise language to the claims in order to one of ordinary skill in the art to make and use the invention as claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 1, 7, 8, 16, 18, 23 and 26-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by 2-6, 17 and 19-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent No. 6,671,681 issued to Emens et al. (hereinafter Emens) in view of US Patent No.: 6,732,088 issued to Glance.

With respect to claim 1, Emens teaches obtaining a query for a database using one or more query generation rules, the database comprising elements, the elements comprising fields, the one or more query generation rules obtaining the query by incorporating, into the query, a selected element of the database and a selected field in the selected element (fig. 1, item 40, a query string is received to search against a database or an information repository; and alternate queries, or query strings which are used to search against a database in the host computer system, are built due to being benefit from other experienced users (more efficient query search based on the knowledge of other experienced searches) and they are most likely more narrow than the initial search query: col. 6, lines 62-67 and col. 6, lines 1-28; also see figs. 1 & 2).

Emens teaches recording a prior search query and an associated prior query search result selected by a prior user during a prior search in a information repository and a retrieval of alternate search query strings (which is including textual descriptions

containing words, phrases or sentence for finding the information in the searchable database) from prior user, that is providing an alternate for a current query associated with a current search result during a current search of an information repository by a current user and the search results, which are generating from search engines are having the best match from the current search queries, which benefit and learn from the previous queries (fig. 1 and fig. 2). Emens does not clearly teach generating a teaser that corresponding to the query, the teaser comprising a textual description.

However, Glance teaches generating a query database including all related queries information (figs. 4 & 5; col. 6, lines 46-67 and col. 7, lines 1-22).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Emens with the teachings of Glance. One having ordinary skill in the art would have found it motivated to utilize the use of generating a query database storing related queries information as disclosed (Glance's fig. 4 & 5), into the system of Emens for the purpose of maintaining the search query 's history information, thereby, improving the search process more efficient (Glance's col. 2, lines 20-30 and col. 7, lines 5-16).

With respect to claims 2-3 and 5, Emens teaches a method as discussed in claim 1. Also Emens teaches the domain corresponding to subject matter of the database (col. 2, lines 62-67 and col. 3, lines 1-22).

Emens teaches recording a prior search query and an associated prior query search result selected by a prior user during a prior search in a information repository and a retrieval of alternate search query strings from prior user, that is providing an

alternate for a current query associated with a current search result during a current search of an information repository by a current user and the search results, which are generating from search engines are having the best match from the current search queries, which benefit and learn from the previous queries (fig. 1 and fig. 2). Emens does not clearly teach further comprising storing the query and the teaser in a lookup table, the query and the teaser so stored comprising a stored query and a stored teaser respectively and displaying the stored teaser if the input query matches the stored query; and wherein the teaser is generated use one or more query matching rules.

However, Glance teaches generating a query database including all related queries information and displaying related queries to user for selection (figs. 4 & 5; col. 6, lines 46-67 and col. 7, lines 1-22; fig. 9 and col. 9, lines 10-20); rule and heuristics (fig. 2 and col. 5, lines 18-37 and col. 7, lines 47-57).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Emens with the teachings of Glance. One having ordinary skill in the art would have found it motivated to utilize the use of storing the query and the teaser in the database as disclosed (Glance's fig. 4 & 5), into the system of Emens for the purpose of maintaining the search query 's history information, thereby, improving the search process more efficient (Glance's col. 2, lines 20-30 and col. 7, lines 5-16).

With respect to claim 4, Emens teaches wherein the one or more query generation rules are domain specific, the domain corresponding to subject matter of the database (col. 2, lines 62-67 and col. 3, lines 1-22).

With respect to claim 6, Emens teaches a method as discussed in claim 1.

Emens teaches recording a prior search query and an associated prior query search result selected by a prior user during a prior search in a information repository and a retrieval of alternate search query strings from prior user, that is providing an alternate for a current query associated with a current search result during a current search of an information repository by a current user and the search results, which are generating from search engines are having the best match from the current search queries, which benefit and learn from the previous queries (fig. 1 and fig. 2). Emens does not clearly teach wherein if the input query matches the stored query; and wherein the teaser is generated use one or more query matching rules.

However, Glance teaches displaying related queries to user for selection (figs. 4 & 5; col. 6, lines 46-67 and col. 7, lines 1-22; fig. 9 and col. 9, lines 10-20); rule and heuristics (fig. 2 and col. 5, lines 18-37 and col. 7, lines 47-57).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Emens with the teachings of Glance. One having ordinary skill in the art would have found it motivated to utilize the use of storing the query and the teaser in the database as disclosed (Glance's fig. 4 & 5), into the system of Emens for the purpose of maintaining the search query 's history information, thereby, improving the search process more efficient (Glance's col. 2, lines 20-30 and col. 7, lines 5-16).

With respect to claim 7, Emens teaches wherein the target database resides on a server connected to the Internet (abstract, col. 2, lines 50-67).

Claim 8 is essentially the same as claim 1 except that it is directed to a computer program stored on a computer-readable medium rather than a method, and is rejected for the same reason as applied to the claim 1 hereinabove.

With respect to claim 16, Emens teaches generating, from a database, queries that correspond to the queries, the database comprising elements, the elements comprising fields, at least one of the queries comprising a selected element of the database and a selected field in the selected element; receiving an input query for the target database and identifying a stored query that corresponding to the input query (fig. 1, item 40, a query string is received to search against a database or an information repository; and alternate queries, or query strings which are used to search against a database in the host computer system, are built due to being benefit from other experienced users (more efficient query search based on the knowledge of other experienced searches) and they are most likely more narrow than the initial search query: col. 6, lines 62-67 and col. 6, lines 1-28; also see figs. 1 & 2; fig. 1, box 10, where the search is received for retrieving the query string results as a summarizing of the best match found to the search request).

Emens teaches recording a prior search query and an associated prior query search result selected by a prior user during a prior search in a information repository and a retrieval of alternate search query strings (which is including textual descriptions containing words, phrases or sentence for finding the information in the searchable database) from prior user, that is providing an alternate for a current query associated with a current search result during a current search of an information repository by a

current user and the search results, which are generating from search engines are having the best match from the current search queries, which benefit and learn from the previous queries (fig. 1 and fig. 2). Emens does not clearly teach generating a teaser that corresponding to the query, the teaser comprising a textual description; storing the teasers and stored teasers and outputting a stored teaser corresponding to the stored query that corresponds to the input query.

However, Glance teaches generating a query database including all related queries information (figs. 4 & 5; col. 6, lines 46-67 and col. 7, lines 1-22) and displaying related queries to user for selection (figs. 4 & 5; col. 6, lines 46-67 and col. 7, lines 1-22; fig. 9 and col. 9, lines 10-20); rule and heuristics (fig. 2 and col. 5, lines 18-37 and col. 7, lines 47-57).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Emens with the teachings of Glance. One having ordinary skill in the art would have found it motivated to utilize the use of generating a query database storing related queries information as disclosed (Glance's fig. 4 & 5), into the system of Emens for the purpose of maintaining the search query 's history information, thereby, improving the search process more efficient (Glance's col. 2, lines 20-30 and col. 7, lines 5-16).

With respect to claim 17, Emens teaches a method as discussed in claim 1.

Emens teaches recording a prior search query and an associated prior query search result selected by a prior user during a prior search in a information repository and a retrieval of alternate search query strings from prior user, that is providing an

alternate for a current query associated with a current search result during a current search of an information repository by a current user and the search results, which are generating from search engines are having the best match from the current search queries, which benefit and learn from the previous queries (fig. 1 and fig. 2). Emens does not clearly teach further comprising storing the query and the teaser in a lookup table, the query and the teaser so stored comprising a stored query and a stored teaser respectively and displaying the stored teaser if the input query matches the stored query; and wherein the teaser is generated use one or more query matching rules.

However, Glance teaches generating a query database including all related queries information and displaying related queries to user for selection (figs. 4 & 5; col. 6, lines 46-67 and col. 7, lines 1-22; fig. 9 and col. 9, lines 10-20); rule and heuristics (fig. 2 and col. 5, lines 18-37 and col. 7, lines 47-57).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Emens with the teachings of Glance. One having ordinary skill in the art would have found it motivated to utilize the use of storing the query and the teaser in the database as disclosed (Glance's fig. 4 & 5), into the system of Emens for the purpose of maintaining the search query's history information, thereby, improving the search process more efficient (Glance's col. 2, lines 20-30 and col. 7, lines 5-16).

With respect to claims 19-23, Emens teaches a method as discussed in claim 1. Also Emens teaches the domain corresponding to subject matter of the database (col. 2, lines 62-67 and col. 3, lines 1-22).

Emens teaches recording a prior search query and an associated prior query search result selected by a prior user during a prior search in a information repository and a retrieval of alternate search query strings from prior user, that is providing an alternate for a current query associated with a current search result during a current search of an information repository by a current user and the search results, which are generating from search engines are having the best match from the current search queries, which benefit and learn from the previous queries (fig. 1 and fig. 2). Emens does not clearly teach further a tree-like data structure, a hash table, in a cache, in a lookup table and displaying the stored teaser upon output.

However, Glance teaches generating a query database including all related queries information and displaying related queries to user for selection, database table for searching (figs. 3, 4 & 5; col. 6, lines 46-67 and col. 7, lines 1-22; fig. 9 and col. 9, lines 10-20).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Emens with the teachings of Glance. One having ordinary skill in the art would have found it motivated to utilize the use of storing the query and the teaser in the database as disclosed (Glance's fig. 4 & 5), into the system of Emens for the purpose of maintaining the search query 's history information, thereby, improving the search process more efficient (Glance's col. 2, lines 20-30 and col. 7, lines 5-16).

Claim 26 is essentially the same as claim 16 except that it is directed to a computer program stored on a computer-readable medium rather than a method, and is rejected for the same reason as applied to the claim 16 hereinabove.

Claim 27 is essentially the same as claim 16 except that it is directed to an apparatus rather than a method (col. 3, lines 66-67 and col. 4, lines 1-54), and is rejected for the same reason as applied to the claim 16 hereinabove.

Claim 28 is essentially the same as claim 1 except that it is directed to an apparatus rather than a method (col. 3, lines 66-67 and col. 4, lines 1-54), and is rejected for the same reason as applied to the claim 1 hereinabove.

Conclusion

8. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).


A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.


Contact Information

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Anh Ly whose telephone number is (571) 272-4039 or via E-Mail: ANH.LY@USPTO.GOV or fax to (571) 273-4039. The examiner can normally be reached on TUESDAY – THURSDAY from 8:30 AM – 3:30 PM. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Breene, can be reached on (571) 272-4107 or Primary Examiner Jean Corrielus (571) 272-4032.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Any response to this action should be mailed to: Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks, Washington, D.C. 20231, or faxed to: **Central Fax Center (571) 273-8300**


JEAN M. CORRIELUS
PRIMARY EXAMINER

ANH LY 
NOV. 30th, 2005